

Attorney Docket No.: **SYM114 (TI-0029)**
Inventors: **Pei et al.**
Serial No.: **09/882,843**
Filing Date: **June 15, 2001**
Page 19

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 8, 10, 11, 16-18, 23, 25, and 26 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-3 and 8 have been allowed. Claims 10, 16-18, 23, 25, and 26 have been rejected. Claims 10, 16 and 25 have been amended. While claim 11 appears to have been objected to, Applicants find no reference to this objection in the Detailed Action. No new matter is added by these amendments. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of these amendments and the following remarks.

I. Withdrawn Rejections

Applicants acknowledge that the rejections of claims 3, 5, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102, §103, and §112, second paragraph (rejections labeled 8a), b), c), d), e), f), g), h), i), j), k), l), m), n), o), p), s), t), u), v), w), x), y) and z)) have been withdrawn and that claims 1-3 and 8 have been allowed.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph

The rejection of claims 16-18, 23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention has been maintained.

In particular, the Examiner suggests that claims 16-18 and 23 are vague and indefinite for failing to indicate the point of attachment of the R¹³O substituent in the R² and R³ moieties. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 16 and 25 to correct this inadvertent typographical error. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at page 11, line 7.

Attorney Docket No.: **SYM114 (TI-0029)**
Inventors: **Pei et al.**
Serial No.: **09/882,843**
Filing Date: **June 15, 2001**
Page 20

Claims 10, 25 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner suggests that claim 10 is vague in that it is not known what is meant by the comma and then semi-colon at the end of the definition of R⁸ and R⁹. Thus, Applicants have corrected this inadvertent typographical error by deleting the comma. Further, claim 10 has been amended to correct the inadvertent omission of a comma after the R¹⁴CO- moiety of R¹, R², R³, and R⁴.

Claim 25 and claims dependent thereon have been rejected as being vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the period which appears at the end of the second to the last line of the claim. To facilitate the prosecution of this application, Applicants have omitted this inadvertent typographical error in claim 25. Further, claim 25 has been amended to correct the inadvertent omission of a comma after the R¹⁴CO- moiety of R¹ and R⁴.

To further advance the prosecution of the present application, Applicants have amended claim 16 to correct the inadvertent omission of commas after the R¹³S- and R¹⁴CO- moieties of R¹ and R⁴.

Withdrawal of these rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested in light of these amendments.

Attorney Docket No.: **SYM114 (TI-0029)**
Inventors: **Pei et al.**
Serial No.: **09/882,843**
Filing Date: **June 15, 2001**
Page 21

III. Conclusion

Applicants believe that the foregoing comprises a full and complete response to the Office Action of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and subsequent allowance of the pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Jane Massey Licata
Registration No. 32,257

Date: **November 15, 2004**

Licata & Tyrrell P.C.
66 E. Main Street
Marlton, New Jersey 08053

856-810-1515